

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE, United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/432,112	11/02/1999	TAKASHI TSUDA	837.1212/JDH	9637
21171	7590 03/18/2004		EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			JUBA JR, JOHN	
SUITE 700 1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2872	

DATE MAILED: 03/18/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Advisory Action	09/432,112	TSUDA ET AL.				
	Examiner	Art Unit				
	John Juba, Jr.	2872				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 19 February 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.						
PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filled is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).						
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:						
(a)						
(b) ☑ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) ☑ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.						
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).						
5. The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.						
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)□ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-4, 15, 16, 25-28, 33-35, 47, 54, 59, and 60</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.						
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						

Continuation of 2. NOTE: A new issue is raised as to the cooperation of fiber types to obviate one or more dispersion compensators. Applicants have not identified where support for such an amendment is to be found in the specification. Thus, the examiner would have to review the specification to resolve the question of new matter. In light of Applicants' proposed claim construction vis-à-vis proposed claim 3, new issues under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph would be raised. For example, the recitation (in claims 1 & 15) "according to" appears to create a conditional statement. The examiner is not sure whether the claims require any dispersion compensators at all. If a prior art dispersion managed transmission line of two types of fibers does not require compensation, has the prior art not provided a compensator according to a requirement determined according to the fiber types and dispersion value? If the claims must be read to require at least one dispersion compensator, then the meaning of "in association with" becomes unclear. If claim 3 permits the omission of a dispersion compensator at the transmitter, how is a dispersion compensator "associated with" each of the transmitter, receiver and amplifier?

JOHN JUBA, JR.
PRIMARY EXAMINER